

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending and under consideration. On August 8, 2006, at approximately 11:47, Eastern Standard Time, the undersigned attorney spoke with Examiner Nghi V. Tran, of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and was advised that the reference to "Holtz" on page 4 of the Office Action is a mistake. According to the Examiner, reference should have been made to, "Klimczak," which the Examiner cited on form "PTO-892."

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,620 (Thatte) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0023180 (Klimczak).

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Thatte does not explicitly show a message and action relationship storing part for storing contents of an action that is a reaction to a message and adapted to search for corresponding action with a message body as a search key.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 4, 6, and 7 are patentable over the references, as neither Thatte nor Klimczak, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests, "a message and action relationship storing part for storing contents of an action that is a reaction to the message and adapted to search for a corresponding action with a message body as a search key," as recited in independent claim 1, for example.

Applicants respectfully submit that Klimczak adds nothing of relevance to Thatte. For example, although Thatte discloses "action items," Thatte does not disclose or suggest a message, of which the action is a reaction thereto. In fact, the action items of Klimczak are simply participants in a user profile system.

Moreover, searching for a corresponding action with a *message body as a search key* is not disclosed or suggested in Klimczak. Although Klimczak indicates that a determination is made regarding whether an action item is present, the reference does not indicate how such a determination is made. In fact, Klimczak suggests that the determination as to whether the action item is present is accomplished by searching the object actions table for the "desired" action by using one of the identifiers as an index, for example, "Object ID 320," or "Action ID 322," which is completely different than the operation of searching with a message body as a search key, as in the present invention. See Klimczak, Figure 5.

In light of the foregoing, independent claims 1, 4, 6, and 7 are patentable over the references. As dependent claims 2-3 and 5 depend from respective independent claims, the

Serial No. 09/988,566

dependent claims are patentable over the references for at least the reasons presented for the independent claims.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after the response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 8/25/06

By: 
Reginald D. Lucas
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501